

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

(Filed: April 12, 2023)

In Re Raj K. Patel

No. 23-af-7028

ORDER

On November 17 and December 9, 2022, the Honorable Loren A. Smith issued orders directing the Clerk of Court to accept no further complaints from Raj K. Patel without both “a motion for leave explaining how the complaint raises new matters properly before the Court” and “an order granting leave to file such filings [or complaints] from the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.” See Orders, Patel v. United States, No. 22-1446, ECF Nos. 14, 16. On January 5, 2023, the undersigned denied Mr. Patel leave to file a new purported complaint, having found that Mr. Patel’s accompanying motion for leave “lacked enough specificity to enable the undersigned to determine whether Mr. Patel’s claims potentially fall within the subject matter jurisdiction of this Court.” See Order Denying Leave to File, In re Patel, No. 23-7028, ECF No. 1.

On January 17, 2023, Mr. Patel filed a motion for reconsideration of the undersigned’s January 5th Order Denying Leave to File. In support of his motion, Mr. Patel argues that “[t]he complaint which was requested to be filed consist only of claims which are money mandating from an Act of Congress which substantiates jurisdiction of this court All contains inside said complaint is from wholly different transaction than all previously filed complaints.” In re Patel, No. 23-7028, ECF No. 4. Mr. Patel also references a petition for writ of mandamus he filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit challenging the undersigned’s January 5th Order. The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit denied Mr. Patel’s mandamus petition on March 7, 2023. See In re Patel, No. 2023-0113 (Fed. Cir. March 7, 2023).

The undersigned finds that Mr. Patel’s motion for reconsideration contains no new information that would help explain how his complaint raises new matters properly before the Court, and that Mr. Patel has not raised any arguments that would otherwise warrant reconsideration. Accordingly, Mr. Patel’s motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



ELAINE D. KAPLAN
Chief Judge